

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Prior to the entry of this Amendment, claims 10-20, 22, and 23 were pending in this application. Claims 10, 11, and 23 have been amended, claim 18-20 and 22 have been canceled, and new claims 24 and 25 have been added herein. Therefore, claims 10-17 and 23-25 are now pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims, as amended, for at least the reasons presented below.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection**

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as reciting the limitation "the first plurality of content object" in the "providing limitation," and further stating that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. the Applicants respectfully point out that claim 18 has been canceled herein thus rendering the rejection moot.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection, Elwahab**

Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication No. 2001/0034754 A1 of Elwahab et al. (hereinafter "Elwahab"). The Applicants respectfully submit the following arguments pointing out significant differences between claims 10 and 17 submitted by the Applicants and Elwahab.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully argue that Elwahab fails to disclose each and every claimed element. For example, Elwahab fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, "abstracting the data type of the first content object" (emphasis added) as recited in claim 10. Additionally, Elwahab fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, "providing a guide, wherein the guide indicates the first plurality of content objects" as recited in claim 18.

Elwahab is directed to "a Markup-Language-type content server used in conjunction with a customer premise gateway, via Markup-Language-type pages (e.g., HTML, XML, and the like), remote access and control of smart devices, appliances, personal computers, and other devices and systems connected at a customer premise via different communication means and protocols." (para. 3) That is, Elwahab discloses a system for allowing a user to remotely control appliances within his home, e.g., HVAC, lighting, security system. (para. 9).

As defined for example on page 5, paragraph 20 of the detailed description of the pending application, a content object is defined as "content maintained as an accessible object that can be accessed, utilized, and/or stored." Furthermore, examples of such content "include, but [are] not limited to, traditional content including movies, music, games, voicemails, emails, software, security video, emergency alerts, and any other content that comes to the home or can be requested from the network via providers." (para. 24) Elwahab does not disclose abstraction or distinction of such content. For example, Elwahab does not disclose abstraction or distinction of video objects, audio objects, etc. or grouping sources of such objects into sources and destinations. Rather, Elwahab describes a system for allowing a user to remotely control appliances within his home, e.g., HVAC, lighting, security system. Furthermore, Elwahab does not disclose abstracting a first content object from a first content object entity in a format compatible with a first content object entity into a second content object in an abstract form and distinguishing the second (abstract) content object to create a third content object in a second content format that is compatible with a second content object entity and different from the first content format.

Claim 10, upon which all currently pending claims depend, recites in part, "accessing a first content object from a first content object entity within the customer's premises, wherein the first content object is in a first content format compatible with the first content object entity; abstracting the data type of the first content object to create a second content object in an abstract format, wherein the abstract format is compatible with a plurality of content formats; distinguishing the data type of the second content object to create a third content object, wherein the third content object is in a second content format that is compatible with a second content

object entity within the customer's premises and different from the first content format."

Elwahab does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, abstracting a first content object from a first content object entity in a format compatible with a first content object entity into a second content object in an abstract form and distinguishing the second (abstract) content object to create a third content object in a second content format that is compatible with a second content object entity and different from the first content format. Rather, Elwahab describes a system for allowing a user to remotely control appliances within his home, e.g., HVAC, lighting, security system. For at least these reasons, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection, Elwahab**

Claims 18-20, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046437 of Eytchison et al. (hereinafter "Eytchison"). The Applicants respectfully point out the claims 18-20 and 22 have been canceled herein thereby rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Furthermore, claim 23 has been amended to depend upon claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is thought to be allowable. Therefore, claim 23 is also thought to be allowable at least by virtue of its dependence on an allowable base claim. For at least these reasons, the Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections, Elwahab in view of Jeffrey**

The Office Action has rejected claims 11-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Elwahab as applied to claims 1-10 and 17-19 above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,576,981 of Jeffrey (hereinafter "Jeffrey"). As discussed above, claim 10, upon which claims 11-14 and 16 depend is thought to be allowable. Therefore, claims 11-14, and 16, are also thought to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on an allowable base claim. For at least these reasons, the Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections, Elwahab and Jeffrey and further in view of Baer**

The Office Action has rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Elwahab and Jeffrey, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,840 of Baer et al (hereinafter "Baer"). As discussed above, claim 10, upon which claim 15 depends, is thought to be allowable. Therefore, claim 15 is also thought to be allowable at least by virtue of its dependence on an allowable base claim. For at least these reasons, the Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Dated: April 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/William J. Daley/  
William J. Daley  
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver)  
Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver)  
WJD/jep  
61309360 v1